AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The Examiner is requiring descriptive labels for Figures 3-6 that have been added as identified. Replacement sheets with the requested descriptive detail are being filed herewith. The terms "LC" and "AM" have been omitted in the replacement sheets.

REMARKS

I. AMENDED INDEPENDENT CLAIM 9 AND 18 POSSESS LIMITATIONS NOT FOUND IN THE '509 PATENT

The Examiner rejected independent Claim 9 and Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of the '509 Patent. Applicant respectfully suggests that the '509 Patent does not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed invention and in fact teaches away from the invention.

The invention is a continuation session attribute transmittal in a single control message that prevents the deallocation of the IP address for a mobile node, which prevents the termination of a mobile node's connectivity even though the mobile node has transitioned to a new cell on the mobile system. The method of independent Claim 9 specifically calls for continuing a multipart communication using a control message causing a multipart communication session to continue by preventing deallocation of the address for the mobile node without additional message transmissions. The method of Claim 18 specifically calls for continuing a multipart communication and likewise uses a continuation session attribute attached to a control message to continue the ongoing communication session by preventing deallocation of the mobile node address.

In contrast, the '509 Patent does not prevent the deallocation of an address. In fact, for mobile communication, the method of the '509 Patent updates tables on the Anchor LAC by changing the IP address from the old Serving LAC to the new Serving LAC IP address. The Continued-Call-Reply message provides this new information to the Anchor LAC to use to update its tables and includes the Serving LAC IP address.

'509 Patent, col. 9, ln 56 – col. 10, ln 11. There is thus a change in the IP address that includes a deallocation of the IP address for routing to the mobile node.

II. AMENDED INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1 POSSESSES LIMITATIONS NOT FOUND IN THE '509 PATENT OR THE TR45 REFERENCE, ALONE OR IN COMBINATION

The Examiner rejected independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the '509 Patent and the TR45 reference. Applicant respectfully suggests that the two references do not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed invention and in fact teach away from the invention.

Claim 1 uses a claimed control message transmission to prevent deallocation of a mobile node address and continue a multipart communication session. The protocol taught in the combination of the '509 Patent and the TR45 reference fails to teach, disclose, or suggest this claimed single control message protocol that prevents the deallocation of the mobile node address. The '509 Patent does not prevent a deallocation of the mobile node address. For mobile communication, the system of the '509 Patent updates its tables on the Anchor LAC by changing the IP address from the old Serving LAC to the new Serving LAC IP address. The Continued-Call-Reply message provides this new information to the Anchor LAC to use to update its tables and includes the Serving LAC IP address. *'509 Patent, col. 9, ln 56 – col. 10, ln 11.* There is thus a change in the IP address that includes a deallocation of the IP address for routing to the mobile node, and the combination of the TR45 reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitation of preventing deallocation of the address.

Finally, the Examiner's referenced sections of the '509 Patent fail to disclose, suggest, or teach a server allocating addresses to the mobile node as that term is used in the specification of the application and claimed. There is no suggestion in the '509 Patent that the RADIUS server, which is assumed to perform accounting functions by definition, also acts to assign addresses for the mobile node. While accounting functions are inherent to a RADIUS server in light of the TR45 reference, assigning IP addresses to the mobile node is not such an inherent function. It is inappropriate to assume that the RADIUS server in the '509 Patent functions to make IP address assignments, which it must do to meet the claim limitations of Claim 1, without some specific indication within the specification or the claims of the '509 Patent that it does so; which the references do not.

III. CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application because the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and § 102(e) rejections are believed to have been traversed by the present Response. It is further believed that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection has been rendered moot by the amended Claim 1, which specifically claims an established communication session on the first network. Replacement drawings are being provided as well to add descriptive labels as requested by the Examiner.

Independent Claims 1, 9, and 18 are believed allowable, because essential claim elements are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the cited reference, alone or in

combination. Since the dependent claims add further limitations to the allowable independent claims, the Applicant believes the dependent claims are likewise allowable.

It is believed that no additional fees are necessary for this filing. If additional fees are required for filing this response, then the appropriate fees should be deducted from D. Scott Hemingway's Deposit Account No. 501,270.

Respectfully submitted,

Malcolm W. Pipes
Reg. No. 46,995
Attorney for Applicant

Hemingway & Hansen, LLP
Bank One Building, Suite 2500
1717 Main Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 292-8301 (voice)
(214) 739-5209 (fax)